

China's piracy of United States CD's, videotapes, software and other intellectual properties costs the United States Economy at least \$1 billion a year. This means lost American jobs.

The administration's actions, after prolonged negotiations, are long overdue. Indeed, many of us had encouraged President Bush to take this action instead of giving credence to the United States-China memorandum of understanding on intellectual property a few years ago.

Indeed, this action is the same one many of us had urged the administration to take on behalf of promoting human rights in China.

While I am pleased the Clinton administration has taken this step, it is ironic that such an action is being taken to protect products, but that it was not taken to protect human life and human rights. The United States business community is now seeing that human rights and economic certainty are connected as they face problems with a lack of rule of law and respect for contracts in China.

There are other ironies in this decision, Mr. Speaker. Last year, when the President granted MFN to China unconditionally, the argument was made that the approach targeting sanctions on State enterprises including products made by the People's Liberation Army advanced by then Senator majority leader Mitchell, then House majority leader GEPHARDT, majority whip, BONIOR, and me, was not implementable.

□ 1930

And in an August 5 letter to Members the Commissioner of Customs stated that our approach would not work because there are no longer clear distinctions between companies that are State-owned enterprises and those that are not. It is important to note therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the sanctions scheduled to go into effect February 26 if the Chinese do not come around and hopefully they will, specifically target some of China's State-owned enterprises including some run by the People's Liberation Army. In fact at its February 4 conference announcing the imposition of sanctions Ambassador Kantor while listing criteria for picking the products for sanctions listed said No. 2, we picked products that were more involved with China's state enterprises than other enterprises. Indeed I also want to call to the attention of our colleagues that last year when we were having this same debate about sanctions on products made especially by State-run industries and the People's Liberation Army that some of our colleagues in fighting our legislation sent a "Dear Colleague" which says:

Imposing sanctions against products produced by the Chinese Army defense-related companies and State-owned enterprises will be unworkable and unenforceable. It would be a logistical nightmare for the U.S. Customs Service to try to manage. Not only is it almost impossible to identify Chinese

Army ownership of Chinese companies but in a mixed economy like China's, it is also virtually impossible to draw clear lines between State and nonState activity.

Well I guess a lot has happened in the past 6 months because we have all of a sudden now, the proposal we are making is indeed one that is being proposed by the administration. I say that once again in support of the action that was taken because those of us who are concerned about human rights in China are also concerned about violations of our trade relationship and also about the proliferation issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER.]

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would just note that the Chinese have a \$24 billion trade surplus.

Ms. PELOSI. If the gentleman would allow, now \$30 billion.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Now \$30 billion. Now a \$30 billion trade surplus with the United States. And for these people, for the Government of China to be running these factory operations, stealing our intellectual property rights, ripping them off, extracting funds from our pockets to the tune of \$1 billion a year, these are the factories that are, as the gentleman has just stated, so clearly these are not private sector factors in China, they are factories run by the government and the army themselves. And this adds insult to injury. They are not just satisfied with a \$29-billion surplus, they have to rip us off and then even export the intellectual property rights, the CD disks, the software that they are producing.

In our State of California hundreds of thousands of people pay for their mortgage, feed their children, clothe their families, educate their children with the money that they get from jobs related to the entertainment industry. We are now on the edge of a new era where ideas and creative instincts become evermore important. This kind of rip-off is incredible and I am very pleased that the gentleman has taken the leadership on this.

#### CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON CHINESE SANCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the Speaker, and I yield to the gentleman from northern California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the Speaker for his directing our debate in this way.

I appreciate the remarks the gentleman has made because indeed the Chinese Government has not only been ripping off our intellectual property, they also have been exporting this intellectual property which they have pirated to other countries in Asia, again

hurting United States jobs here at home.

So I commend the administration for finally placing sanctions on China. I think it is important that our colleagues know because many of us who voted together on this issue that the sanctions that were placed on the Chinese Government are the self-same sanctions we were recommending that the administration at that time said were unworkable when we were proposing them for promoting human rights in China and Tibet.

I would like to make a further point that since the President made his MFN decision, human rights violations in China have increased. The crackdown has intensified in China and Tibet. That can be documented when we have more time.

The trade deficit has increased to \$30 billion in 1994 and is growing. The proliferation issue is still not resolved in China. Indeed, the evidence is that they are still exporting dangerous technology to unsafeguarded countries.

Having said that, I still commend the administration for finally standing tall and taking the action that they did.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. As the gentleman knows, many of the businessmen who decided they were going to make a quick buck and an easy buck making a deal with this dictatorship on the mainland are now finding that they are being ripped off by that Government. The fact is that our own business community that was so much in favor of the most favored nation for the Chinese and said forget human rights are now finding that the Government that abuses the human rights of its ownpeople will certainly negate a contract with a foreigner. And millions upon hundreds of millions of dollars are being lost. I predict even billions of dollars will be lost because this is an outlawed gangster regime and America should be on the side of freedom. It is right in the long run, it is beneficial in the long run.

Ms. PELOSI. If the gentleman will yield further, once again I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to extend my remarks and those of my colleague. The fact is that we will have another evening to talk about the violations of human rights in China, but in addition to the violations of the intellectual property rights—and in China the piracy is rampant, enforcement is absent and the cost to the United States taxpayer and the American worker is huge. In addition to that, they are violating our trade relations with transshipments, exporting of products made by prison labor, by market barriers to United States products going on into China; the list goes on and on. As my colleague so ably said, there is a connection between human rights and business, and that promoting human rights is good for business because then American businesses going into China will know that their contracts will be honored, that

their products will not be made by slave labor and that the rule of law will prevail. And that is a lesson they have learned in the last 8 months. They are not as head over heels in love with going into China doing business now. But we still have to fight for human rights, fight the fight to free Wei Jingsheng and his assistants and some hundreds, maybe thousands of political prisoners as well as the millions in the slave labor camps in China.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 2 and House Joint Resolution 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

#### COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight and I will be joined by some of my colleagues on the Democratic side to talk about the community policing program and the proposal that will be before us later this week to do away with the community policing program and the 100,000 cops as the President has outlined in the past, in last year's crime bill.

So the special order tonight will deal with community policing commonly called cops on the beat or Clinton cops.

Today at a press conference there were representatives from police organizations all over the country, mostly the FOP and the National Association of Police Organizations which represent most of the rank-and-file police officers in the country.

They spoke articulately of the need to get police officers on the street.

The program has been a win-win situation not just for the police officers, not just for fighting crime but especially for the communities in which they serve.

Last night in this Chamber we spoke, a number of us, about community policing, how you need to restore the trust, confidence and faith in the police with the specific area they serve in order to form a working partnership,

working in concert to help with community policing, to combat the crime elements that they face in their communities.

□ 1940

The gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] was here, and he represents San Diego, and they had one of the first programs ever on community policing and the dramatic impact it had on crime in San Diego, and then there was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], Middlesex County, Lowell, MA, where he talked about his role as a district attorney to help to reduce crime.

Mr. Speaker and those folks who are listening to us, there is no one program that is going to solve crime. There is no one police agency in and of itself that can solve crime. We will never solve crime until the citizens we serve work hand in hand with the police officers who are there to help them. Fighting crime is more than just prisons, fighting crime is more than just putting a new law on the book, and it is even more than just police officers. There must be a partnership between the police, the citizens they represent, but most of all it is a responsibility for each and every one of us in this great country.

I would like to speak, if I may, about two programs tonight in my home State of Michigan; the COPS program, as it is called, in Marquette, MI, which is in northern Michigan and is a town of only 17,000 people. But the community policing program works in rural areas as well as in urban areas, but the COPS program was started back in 1990.

In its first 2 years of operation, Mr. Speaker, overall crime in my city dropped 23 percent. As the community police officers get progressively closer to the community in which he lives and serves, more and more citizens are coming forward to report incidents of crime. This is because a community and a community police officer have developed a special relationship that relates to more trust, more confidence, a greater willingness to become involved in the system.

I would like to share with my colleagues some other stories regarding the COPS program in Marquette, MI, because the program is often referred to as just Cops on the Beat. Well, more than just cops on the beat, they must interact with the communities.

A major problem area in Marquette centered around a 116-unit family public housing development the COPS program in Marquette County and Marquette city had developed in coordination with the city police and the public housing authority in an attempt to decrease the crime rates there at the public housing. A police officer, a public housing authority and residents there formed a partnership which was developed to reduce crime and maintain order. The program has lowered crime and has restored a sense of pride in that housing project.

A good example was back in 1991 and 1992, Halloween or Devil's Night, as it is called, with the first 2 years in which there were at least 26 fires, arson fires, per night in and around this housing project. But with the working with the local police departments, volunteers on patrol and CB radios, Mr. Speaker, we have gone on to deter this program, and last year not one arson complaint was answered during Halloween or Devil's Night.

Another one they did in Marquette was the adopt-a-park program, and it was to eliminate the drinking and drugs in a wooded area by the community, and again the COPS program opened up this community, identified the problem and patrolled the area.

Other achievements that COPS programs have helped out is bike registration, bicycle safety, child identification fingerprinting, bike patrols, court-referred workers to do community service work, anti-trespass programs, say no to drug crimes, community child watch program and others. Again the first year the COPS program, and there has been much criticism of the President's program, and you only have so much money. How are you going to pay for 100,000 cops?

Well, as you all know, it is a sharing program—75 percent of the costs of the police office for the first year is paid by the Federal Government, 25 percent is paid by locals. Second year it is a 50-50 match. That is how we can provide 100,000 police officers underneath the crime bill that was passed last year and that took effect as of October 1 this year.

There are 17 police departments in Michigan with COPS programs. The COPS programs throughout the State, the one in Marquette, was rated No. 1, but from a small city like Marquette of 17,000 people you can go on to city like Detroit, our largest city in Michigan.

The recently passed crime bill has awarded the Detroit Police Department 96 new police officers. These officers are currently attending the Detroit Metropolitan Police Academy and are being trained in community policing. Why community policing? Because we know that when police officers work with the folks in which they must serve, it is the greatest positive effect on reducing crime.

The community policing program in Detroit has conducted over 130 residential surveys, has installed security hardware for citizens, has organized over 50 blocks in the city streets into neighborhood watch programs and has increased and provided aggressive patrolling in high drug activity areas. It has created and maintained child safety and substance abuse programs and continues the youth programs to combat violent crime and drug related offenses.

I want to ask in the survey what was the most positive change in these areas just during the last 3 months. The